



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/672,657

09/26/2003

Jan Boer

Boer 8-28-6-6

2318

47386 7590 05/26/2011  
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP  
1300 POST ROAD  
SUITE 205  
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

SINKANTARAKORN, PAWARIS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2464

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/26/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

Ex parte JAN BOER, WILHELMUS DIEPSTRATEN,  
ROBERT JOHN KOPMEINERS, and KAI ROLAND KRIEDTE

---

Appeal 2011-006712  
Application 10/672,657  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before MAHSHID D. SAADAT, CARLA M. KRIVAK, and  
ELENI MANTIS MERCADER, Administrative Patent Judges.

KRIVAK, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134(a) from a final rejection of  
claims 1-10 and 18-23. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We reverse.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellants' claimed invention is a wireless communication device and method that detects collisions resulting from the non-receipt of an acknowledgement message (Spec. 1:6-8).

Independent claim 1, reproduced below, is representative of the subject matter on appeal.

1. A first wireless communication device, comprising:

a controller configured to monitor for an acknowledgement (ACK) message transmitted by a second wireless communication device in response to a message transmitted by said first wireless communication device, and

a collision detector that monitors a wireless medium for collisions of said acknowledgement message based on a comparison of an energy level and an energy level threshold, preamble detection, and payload detection.

## REFERENCES and ANALYSIS

The Examiner rejected claims 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon the teachings of Wang (US 5,721,733), Currivan (US 2003/0026283 A1) and Kanterakis (US 6,169,759 B1).

The Examiner finds claims 18-23 are patent ineligible under 35 U.S.C. § 101 “because the recitation of a processor in itself does not tie the process steps to a ‘particular’ machine” (Ans. 4). The Examiner also finds Currivan discloses detecting a collision based on a signal-to-noise (SNR) indication signal, thus providing a collision detector that monitors collisions based on an energy level (Ans. 6).

Appellants contend claims 18-23 are patent eligible because these claims require a wireless communication network in addition to the steps of the claim being performed by a processor (App. Br. 3; Reply Br. 2). We agree and find the processor is specifically programmed as asserted by Appellants and supported by the Specification (Reply Br. 2).

Appellants also contend Currivan does not disclose collisions are detected based on a comparison of an energy level and an energy level threshold as claimed. Rather, Currivan discloses an output signal indicates an average SNR of a burst transmission. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Appellants assert an SNR is a ratio and not a measured energy level, as is known to those skilled in the art. (App. Br. 4-5; Reply Br. 4) We agree. Thus, claims 1-23, which were not argued separately, are not obvious over the combination of Wang, Currivan, and Kanterakis, as Currivan and Kanterakis do not cure the deficiencies of Wang.

#### DECISION

The Examiner's decision rejecting claims 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is reversed.

REVERSED

kis